

University Assessment Committee
July 29, 2003
Fetzer Boardroom

Members present: Dr. Noni Threinen (**Chair**), Dr. Jim Amundson, Dr. Dale Healey, Dr. Lynne Hvidsten, Mr. John Pirog, Ms. Jane Richardson, Dr. Rob Scott, Dr. Chuck Sawyer, Ms. Emily Tweed, Mr. Tony Wangerin, Dr. Jane Wittich

Absent: Dr. Anita Manne, Ms. Lisa Simensen

Review Minutes:

Minutes from the July 1, 2003 meeting were presented and reviewed.

Motion *Healey, Richardson* to approve the July 1, 2003 minutes with minor changes.

Introductions – new student member:

Dr. Threinen introduced Tony Wangerin, a T-2 chiropractic student, who will replace Cody Hoefert on the Assessment Committee. Ms. Tammy Walz, the President of the Student Senate, was also introduced to the Committee. Everyone introduced themselves, and welcomed Tony & Tammy to the Assessment Committee.

Review of purpose and goals/progress to date:

Dr. Threinen gave an overview of the purpose and goals of the University Assessment Committee, adding the ultimate goal of the process is to improve student learning. Included in this process is working toward improving all our academic programs. Dr. Threinen added that if Tony Wangerin or Tammy Walz have any questions regarding the assessment review process, she encouraged them to ask questions.

Reports/Updates:

AAHE Roundtable Discussion:

Dr. Hvidsten gave an overview of the round table discussion entitled “*Around the Campus in 365 Days, One Approach to Designing and Implementing an Institutional Assessment Plan*”. Dr. Threinen also elaborated on the round table discussion at the university and program level. It was noted that we haven’t completed an entire assessment cycle yet.

The process in the past year has included:

1. Initiate the process
2. Define the focus
3. Establish the timeline

4. Develop outcomes
5. Assign Curriculum Assessment Teams
6. Create curricular mapping
7. Implement measurement and analysis
8. Provide documentation
9. Evaluate progress-to-date

This information will also be placed on the CTL Assessment webpage. Dr. Threinen reported there was good feedback from conference attendees at the roundtable discussion. Dr. Hvidsten also commented that after visiting with other individuals at the conference, it appears we're not as far behind in our assessment review process as we might think.

Massage Therapy:

Dr. Dale Healey stated his group is beginning the process for developing a proposed grading rubric for written communication. They plan on making a few minor changes to make it more user friendly.

Communication Rubric Subcommittee:

Emily Tweed presented and reviewed a draft of the proposed grading rubrics for written communications, developed by the subcommittee that she is chairing. The Committee discussed what the numbers 1, 2, 4 and 5 mean on the rating scale. John Pirog discussed his reasoning for the numeric and language utilized in the rating scale, adding the subcommittee is seeking the right "tone" for the language utilized in the rubric, which is geared toward the student population. It was also noted that we want one overall rubric template for all academic programs.

Drs. Scott & Amundson believes that faculty could work with this rubric. Dr. Hvidsten suggested that perhaps Level I of the rubric should read "not understandable or "not legible" and blend language upward from that perspective. The Committee also discussed the possibility of utilizing a rating scale of 1 through 5, and the advantages/disadvantages of making this change. Dr. Sawyer also suggested utilizing a rating scale with built in latitude, say 1.5-1.0, etc. Dr. Threinen felt this might be too confusing to interpret the results from that type of scale. She also commented that she prefers a standardized approach for statistical analysis.

John Pirog suggested that perhaps it might be helpful to have a Research individual provide input regarding analyzation of the scales.

Action: Dr. Threinen will do some research for a standardized student rating scale from other universities, and will report back to the committee.

Assessment Feedback Loop:

Dr. Threinen reviewed Charts 1 & 2 of the Assessment Feedback Loop and explained how the flow of data will be processed.

Action Plan Draft:

Dr. Threinen presented and reviewed the updated action plan draft dated 7-15-03. She identified who is responsible for highlighted actions. Items that are in bold print need to be worked on first.

Action: Dr. Threinen requested that members of the Assessment Committee identify at the program level what actions and corresponding timelines should be. She requested this info be provided to her no later than July 29th, in order for her to compile the data before the next Assessment Committee meeting scheduled on August 5th.

Minutes written by: Diane Newcomer

Approved by: _____
Noni Threinen, D.C., Chair
University Assessment Committee

Cc: Dr. Chuck Sawyer,
Senior Vice President